

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant*

PIN	4558	COUNTY	Riverside
APPLICANT	San Jacinto River Watershed Council	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$500,000
PROJECT TITLE	San Jacinto Watershed Component of the Santa Ana Integrated Watershed Plan	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$787,000

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Develop implementation plans to address competing water quality, agriculture, water supply, habitat and flood control needs within the upper watershed area and a Septic System Management Plan.

**WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.**

**Score:** 15

**Comment:** The work plan provides a clear, highly detailed, thoroughly documented, logically sequenced series of tasks and deliverables. The plan and schedule appear consistent. The schedule appears aggressive, but should be achievable. Budget amounts appear reasonable and are supported with underlying assumptions.

**DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 5

**Comment:** The applicant describes the proposed region for the IRWMP, the San Jacinto Watershed, in a high level of detail and seems to address all criteria thoroughly. The various watershed and agency boundaries are well defined and maps are provided showing project areas proposed for studies. This region overlaps with the Western MWD PIN #4156.

**OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 10

**Comment:** The strategic objectives are clearly identified, as are major water related issues and existing conflicts concerning water management, including: water quality, water supply and reuse issues involving groundwater and lake management, competing needs for flood control, habitat conservation, water supply and water quality, flood protection as environmental justice, land use planning, flood plain management, and habitat conservation. The proposal identifies the benefit of being consistent with the Regional Water Board's WMI and other regional and statewide water quality plans and policies.

**INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 8

**Comment:** The application includes multiple management strategies developed through stakeholder processes, existing documents/data, and additional studies. The proposal integrates with others as a complimentary planning process. However, this proposal is primarily for a surface water management plan with relatively less focus on groundwater issues (mainly in the Hemet San Jacinto GW basin & some nitrate/TDS contamination concerns). There is little discussion on conjunctive use, surface/groundwater interaction & related issues. NOTE: The area of the watershed around Lake Elsinore overlaps with the WMWD Service Area. It appears that two different proposed IRWMPs may be looking at different aspects of water resources management in the same area instead of integrating their efforts.

**IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 8

**Comment:** The institutional structure of entities that will implement the IRWMP is described in detail. The general schedule of implementation elements will coincide with the TMDL implementation plan schedule. The implementation of NPS Management Measures is discussed in general terms. The proposal identifies a mechanism for revising the IRWMP through adaptive management and monitoring implementation effectiveness through water quality monitoring. The proposed IRWMP would be adopted into SAWPA's existing IRWMP. However, it is not clear where the IRWMP fits within the priorities of SAWPA's larger IRWMP.

**IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 10

**Comment:** The proposal lists a number of probable benefits representing relevant water management issues affecting the project area. Positive impacts of the proposal are in line with the benefits listed. The tasks include an analysis of costs and benefits associated with the proposed work, to further refine the benefits and potential impacts of the planning effort. The applicant states that development of an IRWMP does not require CEQA, but proposes a CEQA-type public participation process that will be used during IRWMP development. The applicant further states that CEQA compliance will be needed for each implementation project the IRWMP recommends.

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant*

**DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 5

**Comment:** The proposal identifies a number of existing plans and studies that will be used, and proposes additional studies to focus on specific problem areas. The data identified should be more than adequate to support the proposed IRWMP.

**DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 5

**Comment:** The proposal indicates that project participants possess existing capacity to more than adequately manage all data produced by the IRWMP, and to provide it to all interested parties in a variety of formats. The applicant plans to use SAWPA's existing database and GIS system for collection and consolidation of data. The applicant also plans to coordinate with CSU San Bernardino in cataloging collected information. Websites maintained by SAWPA and other participants will be used to disseminate data. The applicant understands and recognizes the need for the data it produces to conform to and be compatible with the State Water Board's SWAMP program and with the STORET system that serves USEPA.

**STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 4

**Comment:** The proposal identifies a large number of existing and potential project partners and stakeholders appropriate for the project. The applicant cites several years of experience and recognizes the need to reach out to involve a variety of stakeholders, but it is not clear exactly how these stakeholders will be included or how they will participate in the process. The proposal identifies existing, ongoing, and planned public participation opportunities that will compliment the planned integration effort, and proposes to continue to use one of the lead applicant's governance structure that functionally allows decisions to be formed and influenced by consensus. The proposal identifies a large number of water agencies that will be included in the planning process. The proposal recognizes that there are several DACs in the project's region; representatives of these DACs are targeted to participate in the project. However, how they will address environmental justice issues is not clear.

**DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 3

**Comment:** The applicant clearly identifies and maps DACs, but it is not clear how the IRWMP will directly meet their needs and include them in the planning process. The proposal states that 47% of the population lives within DACs, but the basis for determining that is not explained.

**RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 5

**Comment:** The proposal identifies a wide range of existing local and regional planning documents that will be integrated through the IRWMP. The applicant recognizes the differences between local and regional planning, the causes of these differences, and the value of coordination and consistency between various levels of planning.

**AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 5

**Comment:** It appears from the proposal that one of the greatest strengths of the applicant is coordination between local, regional, state, and federal agencies. The proposal identifies projects that will include local, regional, state, and federal agencies in collaborative planning projects and coordination for subsequent implementation work. The applicant states that a number of local agencies with land use planning authority are already actively involved in current activities with the applicant and the IRWMP should strengthen the coordination that is already occurring.

**TOTAL SCORE: 83**